arXiv:1603.01033v1 [math.RA] 3 Mar 2016

USING STEINBERG ALGEBRAS TO STUDY DECOMPOSABILITY OF LEAVITT PATH ALGEBRAS

LISA ORLOFF CLARK, DOLORES MARTÍN BARQUERO, CÁNDIDO MARTÍN GONZÁLEZ, AND MERCEDES SILES MOLINA

Abstract. Given an arbitrary graph E we investigate the relationship between E and the groupoid G_E. We show that there is a lattice isomorphism between the lattice of pairs (H, S), where H is a hereditary and saturated set of vertices and S is a set of breaking vertices associated to H, onto the lattice of open invariant subsets of $G_E^{(0)}$. We use this lattice isomorphism to characterize the decomposability of the Leavitt path algebra $L_K(E)$, where K is a field. First we find a graph condition to characterise when an open invariant subset of $G_E^{(0)}$ is closed. Then we give both a graph condition and a groupoid condition each of which is equivalent to $L_K(E)$ being decomposable in the sense that it can be written as a direct sum of two nonzero ideals.

1. Introduction

Leavitt path algebras were introduced in [2] and [3] as a generalization of Leavitt algebras ([13]). They are the algebraic counterpart of operator algebras associated to directed graphs ([15]). They have attracted the attention of both, ring theorists and operator algebraists and the techniques that emerged to study these algebras have typically been algebraic, analytic, or a mix of both. In this paper our techniques are more topological in nature.

In [7], the authors show that each Leavitt path algebra $L_K(E)$ is isomorphic to a *Steinberg algebra* defined as follows: first, one constructs a topological groupoid G_E from the directed graph E. Next, the Steinberg algebra associated to E is the convolution algebra of locally constant, compactly supported functions from G_E into the field K.

In this paper, we use the Steinberg algebra model of a Leavitt path algebra to determine its algebraic decomposability. An algebra A is called decomposable if it can be written as the direct sum of two nonzero ideals. For Leavitt path algebras it turns out that decomposability is equivalent to graded decomposability (see Lemma 5.1).

In our main theorem we show that the decomposability of $L_K(E)$ is equivalent to the topological decomposability of G_E. Moreover, we show that $L_K(E)$ is decomposable if and

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 16D70; Secondary 18B40, 06B10.

Key words and phrases. Leavitt path algebra, Steinberg algebra, ample groupoid, direct sum decomposition.

The first author is supported by the Marsden grant 15-UOO-071 from the Royal Society of New Zealand and a University of Otago Research Grant. The last three authors are supported by the Junta de Andalucía and Fondos FEDER, jointly, through projects FQM-336 and FQM-7156. They are also supported by the Spanish Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad and Fondos FEDER, jointly, through project MTM2013-41208-P.

This research took place while the first author was visiting the Universidad de Málaga. She thanks her coauthors for their hospitality.

only if there exists a nonempty, proper, hereditary and saturated subset H of E^0 such that two additional graph conditions are satisfied:

(a) Every infinite path whose vertices are outside of H eventually does not connect to H.
(b) Every infinite emitter having an infinite number of edges connecting to H must be either in H or a breaking vertex for H.

(See the conditions in Theorem 5.2 (iii).)

Before proving our main result (Theorem 5.2), we show how some graph properties and groupoid properties are connected. Consider the lattice $\mathcal{T}_E$ of pairs (H, S) where H is a hereditary saturated subset of vertices and S is a set of breaking vertices of H. We are interested in $\mathcal{T}_E$ because this lattice is isomorphic to the lattice of graded ideals of the Leavitt path algebra ([1, Theorem 2.5.6]).

We establish a lattice isomorphism from $\mathcal{T}_E$ onto the lattice $\mathcal{O}_E$ of open invariant subsets of $G_E^{(0)}$ (see Theorem 3.3). This result generalises [5, Lemma 6.4] to graphs that are not necessarily row-finite. We remark that for row-finite graphs without sinks, Lemma 6.4 in [5] says that there is an isomorphism from the lattice of hereditary and saturated subsets of vertices onto $\mathcal{O}_E$, which is not surprising. However when infinite emitters are present the appropriate lattice to be considered is $\mathcal{T}_E$, which involves not only hereditary and saturated sets but also to breaking vertices, while the lattice $\mathcal{O}_E$ remains the same.

We find our lattice isomorphism from $\mathcal{T}_E$ to $\mathcal{O}_E$ very useful: The lattice structure of $\mathcal{T}_E$ is complicated. In particular, the explicit formula for the $\vee$ relation is notoriously difficult to define. However, the lattice structure of $\mathcal{O}_E$ is the standard one $(\subseteq, \cup, \cap)$. Moreover, we prove that there is also a lattice isomorphism between $\mathcal{O}_E$ and that of the graded ideals of the Steinberg algebra $A_K(G_E)$ (see Corollary 3.9).

The last ingredients we need to prove Theorem 5.2 are necessary and sufficient conditions on a pair (H, S) to ensure the corresponding element $U_{H,S} \in \mathcal{O}_E$ is closed, which we give in Proposition 4.1. In fact, the set S of breaking vertices is completely determined as it must be the set of all breaking vertices for the hereditary and saturated set H.

Leavitt path algebra decomposability is also studied in [4]. In the final section we compare our results to those in [4]. We expected our decomposibility conditions to be equivalent to the characterisation given in [4, Theorem 4.2]. However, we find that [4, Theorem 4.2] is incorrect; see Example (6.1) for a counterexample. In Theorem 6.5 we provide a modified formulation which also appears in [4, Proposition 4.5] and [4, Proposition 4.6]. We then show the equivalence between the graph conditions in our Theorem 5.2 and the graph condition in Theorem 6.5.

2. Preliminaries

Directed Graphs. A *directed graph* is a 4-tuple $E = (E^0, E^1, r_E, s_E)$ consisting of two disjoint sets E^0, E^1 and two maps $r_E, s_E : E^1 \to E^0$. The elements of E^0 are the *vertices* and the elements of E^1 are the edges of E. Further, for $e \in E^1$, $r_E(e)$ and $s_E(e)$ are called the *range* and the *source* of e, respectively. If there is no confusion with respect to the graph we are considering, we simply write $r(e)$ and $s(e)$.

A vertex which emits no edges is called a *sink*. A vertex v is called an *infinite emitter* if $s^{-1}(v)$ is an infinite set, and a *regular vertex* if it is neither a sink nor an infinite emitter. The

set of infinite emitters will be denoted by $\mathrm{Inf}(E)$ while $\mathrm{Reg}(E)$ will denote the set of regular vertices.

In order to define the Leavitt path algebra, we need to introduce the *extended graph of* E. This is the graph $\widehat{E} = (E^0, E^1 \cup (E^1)^*, r_{\widehat{E}}, s_{\widehat{E}})$, where $(E^1)^* = \{e_i^* \mid e_i \in E^1\}$ and the functions $r_{\widehat{E}}$ and $s_{\widehat{E}}$ are defined as

$$r_{\widehat{E}|_{E^1}} = r,\ s_{\widehat{E}|_{E^1}} = s,\ r_{\widehat{E}}(e_i^*) = s(e_i),\ \text{and } s_{\widehat{E}}(e_i^*) = r(e_i).$$

The elements of E^1 will be called *real edges*, while for $e \in E^1$ we will call e^* a *ghost edge*.

A nontrivial *path* μ in a graph E is a finite sequence of edges $\mu = \mu_1 \dots \mu_n$ such that $r(\mu_i) = s(\mu_{i+1})$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$.[1] In this case, $s(\mu) := s(\mu_1)$ and $r(\mu) := r(\mu_n)$ are the *source* and *range* of μ, respectively, and n is the *length* of μ. We also say that μ is *a path from* $s(\mu_1)$ *to* $r(\mu_n)$ and denote by μ^0 the set of its vertices, i.e., $\mu^0 := \{s(\mu_1), r(\mu_1), \dots, r(\mu_n)\}$. By convention $r(\mu_0) := s(\mu)$.

We view the elements of E^0 as paths of length 0. The set of all (finite) paths of a graph E is denoted by $\mathrm{Path}(E)$. In this paper we will also consider infinite paths, i.e., infinite sequences $x = x_1 x_2 \dots$, where $x_i \in E^1$ and $r(x_i) = s(x_{i+1})$ for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$. We denote the set of all infinite paths by E^∞. We also define $s(x) := s(x_1)$.

For vertices u, v we say $u \geq v$ whenever there is a path μ such that $s(\mu) = u$ and $r(\mu) = v$, A subset H of E^0 is called *hereditary* if $v \geq w$ and $v \in H$ imply $w \in H$. A hereditary set is *saturated* if every regular vertex which feeds into H and only into H is again in H, that is, if $s^{-1}(v) \neq \emptyset$ is finite and $r(s^{-1}(v)) \subseteq H$ imply $v \in H$.

Let E be a graph. For every non empty hereditary subset H of E^0, define

$$F_E(H) = \{\alpha \in \mathrm{Path}(E) \mid \alpha_i \in E^1, s(\alpha_1) \in E^0 \setminus H, r(\alpha_i) \in E^0 \setminus H \text{ for } i < |\alpha|, r(\alpha_{|\alpha|}) \in H\}.$$

Leavitt path algebras. Given a (directed) graph E and a field K, the *path K-algebra* of E, denoted by KE, is defined as the free associative K-algebra generated by the set of paths of E with relations:

(V) $vw = \delta_{v,w} v$ for all $v, w \in E^0$.
(E1) $s(e)e = er(e) = e$ for all $e \in E^1$.

The *Leavitt path algebra of E with coefficients in K*, denoted $L_K(E)$, is the quotient of the path algebra $K\widehat{E}$ by the ideal of $K\widehat{E}$ generated by the relations:

(CK1) $e^* e' = \delta_{e,e'} r(e)$ for all $e, e' \in E^1$.
(CK2) $v = \sum_{\{e \in E^1 | s(e) = v\}} e e^*$ for every $v \in \mathrm{Reg}(E)$.

Observe that in $K\widehat{E}$ the relations (V) and (E1) remain valid and that the following is also satisfied:

(E2) $r(e)e^* = e^* s(e) = e^*$ for all $e \in E^1$.

One can show

$$L_K(E) = \mathrm{span}\{\alpha\beta^* \mid \alpha, \beta \in \mathrm{Path}(E)\}$$

[1] We warn the reader that this convention has not been universally adopted and some of our references use the path convention of [15], where $s(\mu_i) = r(\mu_{i+1})$.

and that $L_K(E)$ is a $\mathbb{Z}$-graded K-algebra. In particular, for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, the degree n component $L_K(E)_n$ is spanned by the set

$$\{\alpha\beta^* \mid \alpha, \beta \in \mathrm{Path}(E) \text{ and } \mathrm{length}(\alpha) - \mathrm{length}(\beta) = n\}.$$

Our notation for elements of $L_K(E)$ is standard. However, in this paper, we often consider elements of the set $\mathrm{Path}(E)$. In particular, we will not assume any of the structure that comes with elements of the quotient $L_K(E)$. We hope this will not be too confusing and we try to make clear when we are working in $L_K(E)$.

Groupoids and Steinberg algebras. A groupoid G is a generalisation of a group in which the 'binary operation' is only partially defined. For a precise definition see [16]. The *unit space* of G is denoted $G^{(0)}$ and is defined such that

$$G^{(0)} := \{\gamma\gamma^{-1} \mid \gamma \in G\} = \{\gamma^{-1}\gamma \mid \gamma \in G\}.$$

Groupoid *source* and *range* maps $r, s : G \to G^{(0)}$ are defined such that

$$s(\gamma) = \gamma^{-1}\gamma \quad \text{and} \quad r(\gamma) = \gamma\gamma^{-1}.$$

Although the notation and terminology of r and s have both a graphical and a groupoid interpretation, it will be clear from context which one we mean.

Steinberg algebras, introduced in [17], are algebras associated to 'ample' groupoids and are defined as follows. First, a *topological groupoid* is a groupoid equipped with a topology such that composition and inversion are continuous. Next, we say an open subset B of a groupoid G is an *open bisection* if r and s restricted to B are homeomorphisms onto an open subset of $G^{(0)}$. Finally, we say a topological groupoid G is *ample* if there is a basis for its topology consisting of compact open bisections.

Given an ample groupoid G and a field K, the *Steinberg algebra associated to* G is

$$A_K(G) := \mathrm{span}\{1_B \mid B \text{ is a compact open bisection}\}$$

where $1_B : G \to K$ is the characteristic function of B. Addition and scalar multiplication in $A_K(G)$ are defined pointwise. Multiplication is given by the convolution

$$f * g(\gamma) = \sum_{\alpha\beta=\gamma} f(\alpha)g(\beta).$$

For compact open bisections B and D the convolution gives $1_B 1_D = 1_{BD}$. In this paper we will omit the $*$ symbol for the convolution.

In the remainder of this section, we recall how the Leavitt path algebra is isomorphic to a Steinberg algebra. The following construction of a groupoid G_E from an arbitrary graph E can be found in [14] and is a generalisation of the construction found in [12] in that it allows graphs with infinite emitters and/or sinks. Note that [14] considers only countable graphs. Therefore we follow the construction of [6, Example 2.1] which does not require countability. Define

$$X := E^\infty \cup \{\mu \in \mathrm{Path}(E) \mid r_E(\mu) \text{ is a sink}\} \cup \{\mu \in \mathrm{Path}(E) \mid r_E(\mu) \in \mathrm{Inf}(E)\} \text{ and}$$
$$G_E := \{(\alpha x, |\alpha| - |\beta|, \beta x) \mid \alpha, \beta \in \mathrm{Path}(E), x \in X, r_E(\alpha) = r_E(\beta) = s_E(x)\}.$$

A pair of elements in G_E is composable if and only if they are of the form $((x,k,y),(y,l,z))$ and then the composition and inverse maps are defined such that

$$(x,k,y)(y,l,z) := (x,k+l,z) \quad \text{and} \quad (x,k,y)^{-1} := (y,-k,x).$$

Thus

$$G_E^{(0)} = \{(x,0,x) \mid x \in X\} \text{ which we identify with } X.$$

Remark 2.1. For any $v \in E^0$ there exists $y_v \in G_E^{(0)}$ such that $s(y_v) = v$. Indeed, if v is an infinite emitter or a sink, then $y_v = v$. Otherwise $v \in \mathrm{Reg}(E^0)$. Fix $e_1 \in s^{-1}(v)$. If $r(e_1)$ is an infinite emitter or a sink, then we may choose $y_v = e_1$. If it is not, then $r(e_1) \in \mathrm{Reg}(E^0)$ and we repeat the same process in order to set $y_v = e_1 e_2 \dots$ as claimed.

Next we show how G_E can be viewed as an ample groupoid. For $\mu \in \mathrm{Path}(E)$ define

$$Z(\mu) := \{\mu x \mid x \in X, r(\mu) = s(x)\} \subseteq X$$

and for $\mu \in \mathrm{Path}(E)$ and a finite $F \subseteq s^{-1}(r(\mu))$, define

$$Z(\mu \setminus F) := Z(\mu) \cap \Big(G_E^{(0)} \setminus \bigcup_{\alpha \in F} Z(\mu\alpha)\Big).$$

Then the sets of the form $Z(\mu \setminus F)$ are a basis of compact open sets for a Hausdorff topology on $X = G_E^{(0)}$ by [18, Theorem 2.1].

We point out that the topological structure around infinite emitters can be surprising. For example, assume that v is an infinite emitter and that $\{e_n\} \subseteq s^{-1}(v)$ is an infinite set. Then $e_n y_{r(e_n)} \to v$.

Now for each $\mu, \nu \in \mathrm{Path}(E)$ with $r(\mu) = r(\nu)$, and finite $F \subseteq \mathrm{Path}(E)$ such that $r(\mu) = s(\alpha)$ for all $\alpha \in F$, define

$$Z(\mu,\nu) := \{(\mu x, |\mu| - |\nu|, \nu x) \mid x \in X, r(\mu) = s(x)\},$$

and then

$$Z((\mu,\nu) \setminus F) := Z(\mu,\nu) \cap \Big(G_E^{(0)} \setminus \bigcup_{\alpha \in F} Z(\mu\alpha, \nu\alpha)\Big).$$

Now the collection $Z((\mu,\nu) \setminus F)$ forms a basis of compact open bisections that generate a topology such that G_E is a Hausdorff ample groupoid.

Finally, putting everything together we have a graded isomorphism

$$\pi : L_K(E) \to A_K(G_E) \text{ such that } \pi(\mu\nu^* - \sum_{\alpha \in F} \mu\alpha\alpha^*\nu^*) = 1_{Z((\mu,\nu)\setminus F)} \tag{1}$$

as shown in [6, Example 3.2].

3. Lattices

In this paper, one thing we focus on is the topological structure of *invariant* subsets of $G_E^{(0)}$. We say that $U \subseteq G_E^{(0)}$ is invariant if $x \in U$ and $(x,k,y) \in G_E$ then $y \in U$. Equivalently, U is invariant if $y \in U$ and $(x,k,y) \in G_E$ then $x \in U$. Note that if U is invariant then $G_E \setminus U$ is also invariant. Let $\mathcal{O}_E$ denote the set of open invariant subsets of $G_E^{(0)}$. Then $\mathcal{O}_E$ is a lattice with the standard structure given by $(\subseteq, \cup, \cap)$.

Remark 3.1. Fix an invariant $U \subseteq G_E^{(0)}$. Let x and y be in $G_E^{(0)}$ such that x is shift equivalent to y (i.e. x and y are eventually the same). Then $x \in U$ if and only if $y \in U$.

In this section we show that there is a lattice isomorphism from the graph lattice $\mathcal{T}_E$ (defined below) onto the lattice $\mathcal{O}_E$. Following [1, Definitions 2.4.3], let H be a hereditary subset of E^0, and let $v \in E^0$. We say that v is a *breaking vertex of* H if v belongs to the set

$$B_H := \{v \in E^0 \setminus H \mid v \in \mathrm{Inf}(E) \text{ and } 0 < |s^{-1}(v) \cap r^{-1}(E^0 \setminus H)| < \infty\}.$$

In words, B_H consists of those vertices which are infinite emitters, which do not belong to H, and for which the ranges of the edges they emit are all, except for a finite (but nonzero) number, inside H. We set

$$\mathcal{T}_E := \{(H,S) \mid H \text{ is satuarated and hereditary and } S \subseteq B_H\}.$$

These pairs were also considered in a C^*-context, for example in [9, 8]. We define the following relation on $\mathcal{T}_E$:

$$(H_1,S_1) \leq (H_2,S_2) \text{ if and only if } H_1 \subseteq H_2 \text{ and } S_1 \subseteq S_2 \cup H_2.$$

Then $\mathcal{T}_E$ has a lattice structure with explicit formulas for $\vee$ and $\wedge$ given in [4, Remark 3.4] (see also [1, Proposition 2.5.4]). Note that every graded ideal in a Leavitt path algebra is generated by a pair (H,S) as defined in [1, Definition 2.5.3] (see Corollary 3.9).

Definitions 3.2. Let $(H,S) \in \mathcal{T}_E$. Then define

$$U_H := \{x \in G_E^{(0)} \mid r(x_n) \in H \text{ for some } n\}, \tag{2}$$

$$U_S := \{\alpha \in \mathrm{Path}(E) \mid r(\alpha) \in S\} \text{ and} \tag{3}$$

$$U_{H,S} := U_H \sqcup U_S. \tag{4}$$

On the other hand, given $U \in \mathcal{O}_E$, define

$$H_U := \{v \in E^0 \mid Z(v) \subseteq U\} \text{ and} \tag{5}$$

$$S_U := \{r(\alpha) \mid \alpha \in U \cap \mathrm{Path}(E),\ r(\alpha) \text{ is an infinite emitter and } r(\alpha) \notin H_U\} \subseteq U. \tag{6}$$

Theorem 3.3. *Suppose E is an arbitrary graph. Then the map $\phi : \mathcal{T}_E \to \mathcal{O}_E$ given by:*

$$\phi((H,S)) = U_{H,S},$$

is a lattice isomorphism whose inverse is the map $\rho : \mathcal{O}_E \to \mathcal{T}_E$ given by

$$\rho(U) = (H_U, S_U).$$

We will give the proof in a series of lemmas.

Lemma 3.4. *Fix $(H,S) \in \mathcal{T}_E$, then $U_{H,S} \in \mathcal{O}_E$.*

Proof. First we prove that $U_{H,S}$ is open. Fix $x \in U_{H,S}$. If $x \in U_H$ then there exists an n such that $r(x_n) \in H$. Thus,

$$x \in Z(x_1 \cdots x_n) \subseteq U_H$$

because H is hereditary. Now in the case where $x \in U_S$, define

$$F := \{e \in E^1 \mid s(e) = r(x) \text{ and } r(e) \notin H\}$$

which is finite by the definition of S. Then $x \in Z(x \setminus F) \subseteq U_{H,S}$.

Next we show that $U_{H,S}$ is invariant. Consider $(\alpha x, k, \beta x) \in G_E$ such that $\beta x \in U_{H,S}$. If $\beta x \in U_H$ then since H is hereditary, there exists some $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ such that $r(x_n) \in H$. This implies that $\alpha x \in U_H$.

On the other hand, if $\beta x \in U_S$, then $r(\beta x)$ is an infinite emitter and equals $r(\alpha x)$ so $\alpha x \in U_S$. □

Lemma 3.5. *Fix $U \in \mathcal{O}_E$, then $(H_U, S_U) \in \mathcal{T}_E$.*

Proof. First we show that H_U is hereditary. Fix $e \in E^1$ such that $s(e) \in H_U$. To see that $r(e) \in H_U$ it suffices to prove $Z(r(e)) \subseteq U$. So fix $x \in Z(r(e))$. Then $x \in U$ because U is invariant.

Next we show H_U is saturated. Fix a regular vertex v such that $r(s^{-1}(v)) \subseteq H_U$. We must show $v \in H_U$, that is, $Z(v) \subseteq U$. In order to do this fix $x \in Z(v)$. We may write $x = ey$ for some $e \in s^{-1}(v)$. Thus, $r(e) \in H_U$. Thus $Z(r(e)) \subseteq U$. But now we have $y \in Z(r(e)) \subseteq U$. Therefore $x \in U$ again by invariance of U.

Finally we show $S_U \subseteq B_{H_U}$. Fix $v \in S_U$. Note that U invariant implies $v \in U$. Since U is open, there exists a finite $F \subseteq \mathrm{Path}(E)$ such that $Z(v \setminus F) \subseteq U$. Define now

$$F_1 := \{\alpha_1 \mid \alpha = \alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_n \in F\}.$$

We claim that

$$r(s^{-1}(v)) \cap (E^0 \setminus H_U) \subseteq r(F_1).$$

To prove the claim, fix a $w \in r(s^{-1}(v)) \cap (E^0 \setminus H_U)$. Then there is some $e \in E^1$ such that $s(e) = v$ and $r(e) = w \notin H_U$. We know that $Z(e) \subseteq Z(v)$ but since $w \notin H_U$ then $Z(w) \nsubseteq U$ and by invariance $Z(e) \nsubseteq U$ either. Because $Z(v \setminus F) \subseteq U$, we must have

$$Z(e) \cap \Big(\bigcup_{\alpha \in F} Z(\alpha)\Big) \neq \emptyset.$$

Consequently there is some $\alpha \in F$ such that $Z(e) \cap Z(\alpha) \neq \emptyset$ and in fact we must have $\alpha_1 = e$ and hence $w \in r(F_1)$, proving the claim. Since F is finite, we have the finiteness of $r(s^{-1}(v)) \cap (E^0 \setminus H_U)$. This, together with the fact that v is an infinite emitter implies $v \in B_{H_U}$. □

Lemma 3.6. *We have $\phi \circ \rho = 1_{\mathcal{O}_E}$.*

Proof. Fix $U \in \mathcal{O}_E$. Then

$$\phi(\rho(U)) = \phi((H_U, S_U)) = U_{H_U, S_U}.$$

We show that $U_{H_U,S_U} = U$. Starting with the left hand side, fix $x \in U_{H_U,S_U}$.

Case 1. Suppose $x \in U_{H_U}$. Then, there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $r(x_n) \in H_U$. Thus $Z(r(x_n)) \subseteq U$ and hence $x \in U$ by Remark 3.1.

Case 2. Suppose $x \in U_{S_U}$. Then $r(x) \in S_U \subseteq U$. Consequently, $x \in U$ by Remark 3.1.

We have proved $U_{H_U,S_U} \subseteq U$. For the reverse inclusion, fix $x \in U$. We consider the three possibilities for x.

Case 1. Assume $x \in \mathrm{Path}(E)$ and $r(x)$ is a sink. By Remark 3.1 we have that $r(x) \in U$. Now

$$\{r(x)\} = Z(r(x)) \subseteq U$$

and this implies $r(x) \in H_U$ giving $x \in U_{H_U}$.

Case 2. Suppose $x \in E^\infty$. Since U is open, there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$Z(x_1 \dots x_n) \subseteq U.$$

Since each element in $Z(r(x_n))$ is shift equivalent to an element in $Z(x_1 \dots x_n)$ we get $Z(r(x_n)) \subseteq U$ by Remark 3.1. This means $r(x_n) \in H_U$. Then $x \in U_{H_U}$ by Definition 3.2 (2).

Case 3. Finally, assume $x \in \mathrm{Path}(E)$ and $r(x)$ is an infinite emitter. If $r(x) \in H_U$ then $x \in U_{H_U}$ by Definition 3.2 (2). Otherwise, suppose $r(x) \notin H_U$. Then $r(x) \in S_U$ by Definition 3.2 (6). Now $x \in U_{S_U}$ by Definition 3.2 (3).

In all three cases, $x \in U_{H_U,S_U}$ and we are done. □

Lemma 3.7. *We have* $\rho \circ \phi = 1_{\mathcal{T}_E}$.

Proof. Fix $(H, S) \in \mathcal{T}_E$. Then

$$\rho(\phi((H, S))) = \rho(U_{H,S}) = (H_V, S_V),$$

where $V := U_{H,S}$.

We show that $H = H_V$ and $S = S_V$. Fix $v \in H$. To see that $v \in H_V$ it suffices to show $Z(v) \subseteq V$ by Definition 3.2 (5). Fix $x \in Z(v)$. Then $s(x) = v \in H$ so $x \in U_H$ by Definition 3.2 (2). Thus $x \in V$.

Next, fix $w \in H_V$. By Definition 3.2 (5) we have $Z(w) \subseteq V$. By way of contradiction, assume $w \notin H$. We will show that there exists an infinite path x such that $s(x) = w$ and $r(x_n) \notin H$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Notice that w is not a sink. For otherwise, $w \in Z(w) \subseteq V$ but $w \notin U_S$ so $w \in U_H$; but then $w \in H$, a contradiction. We next claim that there exists $e_1 \in E^1$ such that $s(e_1) = w$ and $r(e_1) \notin H$. To prove the claim we will consider the two possible cases for w. First, if $w \in \mathrm{Reg}(E)$ the existence of e_1 comes from H being saturated and $w \notin H$. Second, suppose $w \in \mathrm{Inf}(E)$. Then $w \in V$. Since $w \notin U_H$ we must have $w \in U_S$ and therefore $w \in S$. Now the existence of e_1 comes from the definition of B_H. Continuing in this way by replacing w with $r(e_1)$ and noting that $Z(r(e_1)) \subseteq V$ by Remark 3.1, we get an infinite path $x = e_1 e_2 \dots$ such that $r(e_n) \notin H$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Combining $Z(w) \subseteq V$ and $x \in E^\infty \cap Z(w)$ gives $x \in U_H$, contradicting the definition of U_H. Therefore $w \in H$ and we have proved $H = H_V$.

To see that $S = S_V$ notice

$$S = \{r(\alpha) \mid \alpha \in U_S\}.$$

Taking into account $H = H_V$ we have

$$S_V := \{r(\alpha) \mid \alpha \in V \cap \mathrm{Path}(E), r(\alpha) \in \mathrm{Inf}(E) \setminus H\} = S.$$

□

Lemma 3.8. *The maps* ϕ *and* ρ *are both order preserving.*

Proof. Consider $(H_1, S_1), (H_2, S_2) \in \mathcal{T}_E$ such that $(H_1, S_1) \leq (H_2, S_2)$. Notice that by Definition 3.2(2) we obtain $U_{H_1} \subseteq U_{H_2}$. S imilarly, by Definition 3.2(3) we get $U_{S_1} \subseteq U_{S_2} \cup U_{H_2}$ and that ϕ is order preserving.

To see that ρ is order preserving, assume $U, V \in \mathcal{O}_E$ such that $U \subseteq V$. That $H_U \subseteq H_V$ follows immediately from Definition 3.2(5). Now we show $S_U \subseteq S_V \cup H_V$. Take $r(\alpha) \in S_U$. If $r(\alpha) \in H_V$ we are done. Otherwise $r(\alpha) \in S_V$ because $\alpha \in U \subseteq V$. □

Proof of Theorem 3.3. The result follows from the lemmas above and [11, Theorem 8.2] which says that an order preserving bijection between lattices that has an order preserving inverse is a lattice isomorphism. □

Next, we present a corollary connecting our map ϕ to the lattice structure of graded ideals in the algebras. First some notation: for any algebra A, denote by $\mathcal{L}_{gr}(A)$ the lattice of graded ideals of A.

For any open invariant $U \in G_E^{(0)}$ we define the map I from $\mathcal{O}_E$ to the lattice of ideals of $A_K(G_E)$) such that

$$\begin{aligned} I(U) &:= \{f \in A_K(G_E) \mid s(\text{supp} f) \subseteq U\} \\ &= \text{span}\{1_B \mid B \text{ is a compact open bissection such that } s(B) \subseteq U\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $I(U)$ is an ideal of the Steinberg algebra $A_K(G_E)$ by [5, Lemma 3.2]. In Corollary 3.9 we show that I is a lattice isomorphism onto the graded ideals of $A_K(G_E)$.

Finally, in the Leavitt path algebra, for $v \in B_H$, define

$$v^H := v - \sum_{e \in s^{-1}(v) \cap r^{-1}(E^0 \setminus H)} ee^*,$$

and, for any subset $S \subseteq B_H$, define $S^H = \{v^H \mid v \in S\}$. For any subset X in an algebra, we denote by Ideal(X) the ideal generated by X.

Corollary 3.9. *Consider the following diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{L}_{gr}(L_K(E)) & \xrightarrow{\pi} & \mathcal{L}_{gr}(A_K(G_E)) \\ \uparrow{\scriptstyle \varphi'} & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle I} \\ \mathcal{T}_E & \xrightarrow[\phi]{} & \mathcal{O}_E \end{array}$$

where ϕ is the map defined in Theorem 3.3, π is as defined in (1) and

$$\varphi'((H, S)) = \text{Ideal}(H \cup S^H).$$

Then the diagram is commutative and all the maps are lattice isomorphisms.

Proof. Since ϕ, φ' and π are lattice isomorphisms it suffices to show that

$$(I \circ \phi)((H, S)) = (\pi \circ \varphi')((H, S))$$

for all $(H, S) \in \mathcal{T}_E$.

Fix $(H,S) \in \mathcal{T}_E$. For $w \in S$ define $F_w := \{e \in s^{-1}(w) \cap r^{-1}(E^0 \setminus H)\}$. We have $(I \circ \phi)((H,S)) = I(U_{H,S})$ and

$$\begin{aligned}(\pi \circ \varphi')((H,S)) &= \pi(\mathrm{Ideal}(H \cup S^H)) \\ &= \mathrm{Ideal}\left(\bigcup_{v\in H}\{1_{Z(v)}\} \cup \left(\bigcup_{w\in S}\left\{1_{Z(w)} - \sum_{e\in F_w} 1_{Z(e,r(e))}1_{Z(r(e),e))}\right\}\right)\right) \\ &= \mathrm{Ideal}\left(\bigcup_{v\in H}\{1_{Z(v)}\} \cup \left(\bigcup_{w\in S}\left\{1_{Z(w)} - \sum_{e\in F_w} 1_{Z(e)}\right\}\right)\right) \\ &= \mathrm{Ideal}\left(\bigcup_{v\in H}\{1_{Z(v)}\} \cup \left(\bigcup_{w\in S}\left\{1_{Z(w\setminus F_w)}\right\}\right)\right).\end{aligned}$$

First we show $(\pi \circ \varphi')((H,S)) \subseteq (I \circ \phi)((H,S))$. Fix an element $v \in H$. Then we have $1_{Z(v)} \in I(U_{H,S})$ because $\mathrm{supp}(1_{Z(v)}) \subseteq U_H$. Now, fix $w \in S$. Then $1_{Z(w\setminus F_w)} \in I(U_{H,S})$ as $\mathrm{supp}(1_{Z(w\setminus F_w)}) \subseteq U_{H,S}$. Thus $(\pi \circ \varphi')((H,S)) \subseteq (I \circ \phi)((H,S))$ as every generator of $(\pi \circ \varphi')((H,S))$ belongs to $(I \circ \phi)((H,S))$.

Now we prove $(I \circ \phi)((H,S)) \subseteq (\pi \circ \varphi')((H,S))$. Fix a generator $1_B \in (I \circ \phi)((H,S))$. First observe that the collection

$$\{Z(\alpha)\}_{\alpha\in F_E(H)} \cup \{Z(\alpha \setminus F_{r(\alpha)})\}_{r(\alpha)\in S}$$

forms a disjoint open cover of $U_{H,S}$. Thus there exist finite subsets $A_H \subseteq F_E(H)$ and $A_S \subseteq S$ such that

$$\mathcal{F} := \{Z(\alpha)\}_{\alpha\in A_H} \cup \{Z(\alpha \setminus F_{r(\alpha)})\}_{r(\alpha)\in A_S}$$

is a disjoint finite subcover of the compact set $s(B)$. We claim that

$$f := \sum_{C\in\mathcal{F}} 1_C \in (\pi \circ \varphi')((H,S)).$$

First fix C in A_H. There exists $\alpha \in F_E(H)$ such that

$$C = Z(\alpha) = Z(\alpha, r(\alpha))Z(r(\alpha)).$$

Since

$$1_C = 1_{Z(\alpha))} = 1_{Z(\alpha,r(\alpha))Z(r(\alpha))} = 1_{Z(\alpha,r(\alpha))}1_{Z(r(\alpha))}$$

we have

$$1_C \in \ (\pi \circ \varphi')((H,S))$$

because $1_{Z(r(\alpha))} \in \ (\pi \circ \varphi')((H,S))$.

Next, fix $C \in \{Z(\alpha \setminus F_{r(\alpha)})\}_{r(\alpha)\in A_S}$. So there exists α such that $r(\alpha) \in S$ and

$$C = Z(\alpha \setminus F_{r(\alpha)} = Z(\alpha, r(\alpha))Z(r(\alpha) \setminus F_{r(\alpha)}).$$

Since

$$1_{Z(r(\alpha)\setminus F_{r(\alpha)})} \in (\pi \circ \varphi')((H,S))$$

we have

$$1_C = 1_{Z(\alpha,r(\alpha))Z(r(\alpha)\setminus F_{r(\alpha)})} = 1_{Z(\alpha,r(\alpha))}1_{(Z(r(\alpha)\setminus F_{r(\alpha)})} \in (\pi \circ \varphi')((H,S)).$$

Thus $f \in (\pi \circ \varphi')((H,S))$ as claimed. Now

$$1_B = 1_B f \in (\pi \circ \varphi')((H,S)).$$

□

4. Clopen invariant sets

In this section we give necessary and sufficient conditions on a pair $(H, S) \in \mathcal{T}_E$ to ensure that $U_{H,S}$ is a clopen invariant set. Since $U_{H,S}$ is always an open invariant set (Lemma 3.4), we characterize when it is also closed.

Let E be an arbitrary graph. For any subset $X \subseteq E^0$ and any vertex v, we denote by $\mathrm{Path}(v, X)$ the set of all finite paths α such that $s(\alpha) = v$ and $r(\alpha) \in X$.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $(H, S) \in \mathcal{T}_E$ and let $U_{H,S}$ be as given in Definition 3.2(4). Then, $U_{H,S}$ is closed if and only if the following two conditions are satisfied:*

(i) *If $x \in E^\infty$ is such that $x^0 \subseteq E^0 \setminus H$, then there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that*

$$\mathrm{Path}(r(x_N), H) = \emptyset.$$

(ii) *If $v \in E^0$ is such that $|\{e \in E^1 \mid s(e) = v \text{ and } \mathrm{Path}(r(e), H) \neq \emptyset\}| = \infty$, then $v \in H \cup S$.*

Proof. Suppose that $U_{H,S}$ is closed. To see that condition (i) holds, fix $x \in E^\infty$ such that $x^0 \subseteq E^0 \setminus H$. By way of contradiction, suppose for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $\mathrm{Path}(r(x_n), H) \neq \emptyset$. Choose $(\alpha)_n \in \mathrm{Path}(r(x_n), H)$ and consider the sequence:

$$\left(\left(x_1 \dots x_n (\alpha)_n y_{r((\alpha)_n)}\right)_n\right) \subseteq U_H,$$

where $y_{r((\alpha)_n)}$ is as in Remark 2.1. Notice that this sequence converges to $x \notin U_{H,S}$, which is a contradiction because $U_{H,S}$ is closed. Thus, condition (i) holds.

To see that condition (ii) holds, fix $v \in E^0$ such that

$$|\{e \in E^1 \mid s(e) = v \text{ and } \mathrm{Path}(r(e), H) \neq \emptyset\}| = \infty.$$

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, choose $e_n \in E^1$ such that $s(e_n) = v$, $\mathrm{Path}(r(e_n), H) \neq \emptyset$ and $e_n \neq e_m$ for $m \neq n$. Also choose $(\alpha)_n \in \mathrm{Path}(r(e_n), H)$. Now the sequence $(e_n(\alpha)_n y_{r((\alpha)_n)}) \subseteq U_H$, where $y_{r((\alpha)_n)}$ is as in Remark 2.1. Then $(e_n(\alpha)_n y_{r((\alpha)_n)}) \to v$; since $U_{H,S}$ is closed, we have $v \in U_{H,S}$. Therefore $v \in H \cup S$.

Conversely, assume that conditions (i) and (ii) are satisfied. Fix a sequence $((x)_n) \subseteq U_{H,S}$ such that $(x)_n \to z$. We consider the possible cases for z.

Case 1. Suppose $z \in \mathrm{F}(E)$ and $r(z)$ is a sink. Then $\{z\} = Z(z)$ is an open set and hence $(x)_n = z$ eventually. Thus $z \in U_{H,S}$.

Case 2. Suppose $z \in E^\infty$. If $r(z_m) \in H$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$, then $z \in U_H$ by Definition 3.2(2). Otherwise, suppose $z^0 \subseteq E^0 \setminus H$. By condition (i) there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathrm{Path}(r(z_N), H) = \emptyset$. Notice that z is in the open set $Z(z_1 \dots z_N)$, so we have $(x)_n \in Z(z_1 \dots z_N)$ eventually. However $Z(z_1 \dots z_N) \cap U_H = \emptyset$, thus $(x)_n \in U_S$ eventually. This is a contradiction because $(x)_n \in S$ implies $\mathrm{Path}(r((x)_n), H) \neq \emptyset$.

Case 3. Suppose $z \in \mathrm{F}(E)$ and $r(z) \in \mathrm{Inf}(E)$. If $r(z) \in H$ then $z \in U_H$ and we are done. Similarly, if $(x)_n = z$ eventually, then $z \in U_{H,S}$. So, assume $r(z) \notin H$ and $(x)_n \neq z$ eventually. Define

$$F := \{e \in E^1 \mid s(e) = r(z) \text{ and } \mathrm{Path}(r(e), H) \neq \emptyset\}.$$

We claim that $|F| = \infty$. To prove the claim, by way of contradiction suppose $|F| < \infty$. Then $Z(z \setminus F)$ is an open set containing z and hence $(x)_n \in Z(z \setminus F)$ eventually. Note that for every path $\mu \in Z(z \setminus F)$ with $\mu \neq z$ we have $\mathrm{Path}(r(\mu), H) = \emptyset$. Thus $Z(z \setminus F) \cap U_H = \emptyset$, which implies $(x)_n \in U_S$ eventually. But then $\mathrm{Path}(r((x)_n), H) \neq \emptyset$, which is a contradiction. Therefore $|F| = \infty$. Now condition (ii) implies that $r(z) \in H \cup S$ and hence $z \in U_{H,S}$ as needed. □

Remark 4.2. Note that for any $(H, S) \in \mathcal{T}_E$ we must have $B_H \subseteq \overline{U_{H,S}}$, where $\overline{(\cdot)}$ denotes the topological closure. Indeed, fix $v \in B_H$. We show that any basic neighbourhood of v has nonempty intersection with $U_{H,S}$. Since $v \in \mathrm{Inf}(E)$ it belongs to $G_E^{(0)}$. Consider any basic neighbourhood Z of v. Then $v \in G_E^{(0)}$ implies that Z is of the form $Z(v \setminus F)$. Since $v \in B_H$, there exists an edge e such that $s(e) = v$ and $r(e) \in H$. Extending e to an element $ey_{r(e)} \in G_E^{(0)}$ we can ensure that $ey_{r(e)} \in Z \cap U_{H,S}$. Thus, $Z \cap U_{H,S} \neq \emptyset$ and hence $v \in \overline{U_{H,S}}$. In particular if $U_{H,S}$ is closed, then $B_H \subseteq U_{H,S}$ and so $B_H = S$.

Notice that condition (ii) of Proposition 4.1 implies that S must coincide with B_H. Thus, if $U_{H,S}$ is closed, then $S = B_H$, which is consistent. The reverse implication is not true as the first example that follows will show.

Next, we give some examples to illustrate conditions (i) and (ii) in Proposition 4.1.

Examples 4.3. Consider the graph that follows.



Then $U_{H,\emptyset}$ is not closed because the sequence $(f_1, e_1f_2, e_1e_2f_3, \dots)$ is contained in $U_{H,\emptyset}$ but it converges to $e_1e_2e_3\dots$ which is not in $U_{H,\emptyset}$. On the other hand, condition (i) fails for the infinite path $e_1e_2e_3\dots$.

Now, consider the following graph.



Note that, in this case, for $H = \{v\}$ the open set $U_{H,\emptyset}$ contains the sequence $(e^n f)$ that converges to $ee\dots \notin U_{H,\emptyset}$. So again, $U_{H,\emptyset}$ is not closed. Here, condition (i) fails for the infinite path $eee\dots$.

Finally, for the graph



again we have that the open set $U_{H,\emptyset}$ is not closed, where $H = \{v\}$, because the sequence (f_n) converges to u, which is not an element of $U_{H,\emptyset}$. This time, condition (ii) fails for the vertex u.

5. Decomposability

Let K be a field and E an arbitrary graph. We say that the Leavitt path algebra $L_K(E)$ is *decomposable* if there exists two nonzero ideals I and J in $L_K(E)$ such that $L_K(E) = I \oplus J$.

The equivalence between (i) and (ii) of the following lemma is contained in the proof of [4, Proposition 4.6] but is not stated explicitly. We provide a different proof.

Lemma 5.1. *Let K be a field and E an arbitrary graph. Then the following are equivalent:*

(i) *$L_K(E)$ is decomposable.*
(ii) *There exist nonzero graded ideals I and J such that $L_K(E) = I \oplus J$.*
(iii) *There exists $(H_1, S_1), (H_2, S_2) \in \mathcal{T}_E$ such that $L_K(E) = I((H_1, S_1)) \oplus I((H_2, S_2))$.*

Proof. (ii) implies (i) is trivial. Now assume (i). Suppose $L_K(E) = I \oplus J$, where I and J are not trivial ideals of $L_K(E)$. Since $L_K(E^2) = L_K(E)$, then $L_K(E) = I^2 \oplus J^2$ giving $I = I^2$ and $J = J^2$. By [1, Corollary 2.9.11], this is equivalent to saying that the ideals I and J are graded, which implies (ii).

Finally (ii) and (iii) are equivalent by [1, Theorem 2.5.5]. □

Theorem 5.2. *Let K be a field and E be an arbitrary graph. The following are equivalent:*

(i) *$L_K(E)$ is decomposable.*
(ii) *There exists nonempty clopen invariant subsets U and V in $G_E^{(0)}$ such that $A_K(G_E) = I(U) \oplus I(V)$.*
(iii) *There exists a nonempty, proper, hereditary and saturated subset H of E^0 such that the following conditions are satisfied:*
  (a) *If $x \in E^\infty$ is such that $x^0 \subseteq E^0 \setminus H$, then there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that*
  $$\mathrm{Path}(r(x_N), H) = \emptyset.$$
  (b) *If $v \in E^0$ is such that $|\{e \in E^1 \mid s(e) = v \text{ and } \mathrm{Path}(r(e), H) \neq \emptyset\}| = \infty$, then $v \in H \cup B_H$.*
(iv) *There exists a nonempty clopen invariant subset $U \subsetneq G_E^{(0)}$.*

Proof. The equivalence between (i) and (ii) follows from Lemma 5.1 and Corollary 3.9. To see that (iii) and (iv) are equivalent, notice that if H is as in (iii), then U_{H,B_H} is clopen by Proposition 4.1 giving (iv). Conversely, if U is as in (iv), then there exists $(H, S) \in \mathcal{T}_E$ such that $U = U_{H,S}$ by Theorem 3.3. Since U is closed, H satisfies the conditions of (iii) by Proposition 4.1.

It is easy to see that (ii) implies (iv). Lastly, we show (iv) implies (ii). For U as in (iv) we claim that we have a decomposition

$$A_K(G_E) = I(U) \oplus I(G_E^{(0)} \setminus U).$$

To see this, fix $f \in A_K(G_E)$ and define

$$f_1(\gamma) = \begin{cases} f(\gamma) & \text{if } s(\gamma) \in U \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad f_2(\gamma) = \begin{cases} f(\gamma) & \text{if } s(\gamma) \in G_E^{(0)} \setminus U \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Since U and $G_E^{(0)} \setminus U$ are clopen, $f_1, f_2 \in A_K(G_E)$. Observing that $f = f_1 + f_2$ gives the result. □

6. Compatible Paths

We finish by comparing our results to those in [4]. We point out that the statement of [4, Theorem 4.2] is not correct. Consider the following example.

Example 6.1. Let E be the following graph:



Let $X = \{u_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and $Y = \{w_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Then the only hereditary and saturated sets are $X, Y, \emptyset$ and E^0. Note that $L_K(E)$ is decomposable as $L_K(E) = I(X) \oplus I(Y)$ but X and Y do not satisfy the conditions in [4, Theorem 4.2] because there are infinitely many paths starting outside of $X \cup Y$ and ending in $X \cup Y$.

Theorem 6.5 below comes from combining the statements of [4, Proposition 4.5] and its converse, [4, Proposition 4.6]. Here we give an alternative proof by showing the equivalence between the graph condition in Theorem 5.2 and the graph condition in [4, Proposition 4.5] (that also appears in [10]).

First we fix some definitions.

Definition 6.2. ([4, Definition 4.1]) Let E be an arbitrary graph and H a hereditary and saturated set of vertices. A path $\lambda = \lambda_1 \dots \lambda_{|\lambda|}$, where $\lambda_i \in E^1$, is said to be *H-compatible* if $r(\lambda) \in H$ and $s(\lambda_{|\lambda|}) \notin H \cup B_H$.

Definitions 6.3. Let H be a hereditary and saturated subset of vertices in a graph E and let $v \in E^0 \setminus H$. We define the following sets:

$$C_{v,H} := \{\lambda \in \mathrm{Path}(E) \mid s(\lambda) = v \text{ and } \lambda \text{ is } H\text{-compatible}\}.$$

We say that v satisfies *Property* (P) if $|C_{v,H}| = \infty$.

Lemma 6.4. *Let K be a field and E an arbitrary graph. Assume that $L_K(E)$ is decomposable and let H be a hereditary and saturated subset satisfying conditions (a) and (b) in Theorem 5.2 (iii). If $v \in E^0 \setminus H$ satisfies Property* (P)*, then there exists $e \in s^{-1}(v)$ such that $r(e) \in E^0 \setminus H$ and $r(e)$ satisfies Property* (P)*.*

Proof. Decompose $s^{-1}(v) = A \sqcup B$, where $A := \{e \in s^{-1}(v) \mid r(e) \in H\}$. We claim that $B \neq \emptyset$. By way of contradiction, assume $B = \emptyset$. We distinguish two cases. If $|A| = \infty$ then, by condition (b) we have $v \in H \cup B_H$. Since we are assuming $v \notin H$ then $v \in B_H$. But this is a contradiction because $B = \emptyset$. Assume $|A| \neq \infty$. Note that $|A| \neq 0$ because v is not a sink. Since H is a saturated set we have $v \in H$, a contradiction. Therefore $B \neq \emptyset$.

Case 1: the set A is infinite. By condition (b) and since $v \notin H$ we have $v \in B_H$. Note that $0 \neq |B| \lneq \infty$. Since $|C_{v,H}| = \infty$ and for every $e_1 \dots e_n \in C_{v,H}$ the edge e_1 must be in B, then there exists $f \in B$ such that $f\gamma \in C_{v,H}$, for some $\gamma \in \mathrm{Path}(E)$ and $r(f)$ satisfies Condition (P). In this case we are done.

Case 2: the set A is finite. We are assuming that $|C_{v,H}| = \infty$. Since $v \notin H \cup B_H$, by condition (b) the set of edges which are the first edge of an H-compatible path is finite. In this case, we repeat the same argument as before and find $f \in B$ such that $f\gamma \in C_{v,H}$, for some $\gamma \in \mathrm{Path}(E)$ and $r(f)$ satisfies Condition (P). Again in this case we are done. This finishes the proof. □

Theorem 6.5. *Let K be a field and E an arbitrary graph. Then $L_K(E)$ is decomposable if and only if there exist two nontrivial hereditary and saturated subsets H_1 and H_2 such that $H_1 \cap H_2 = \emptyset$ and for every $v \in E^0 \setminus (H_1 \cup H_2)$, there exists at least one but finitely many paths starting at v which are either H_1-compatible or H_2-compatible.*

Proof. Assume first that there exists a hereditary and saturated subset H_1 satisfying the conditions in Theorem 5.2 (iii). Since $U_{H_1,B_{H_1}}$ is a clopen invariant set (by Proposition 4.1), then $G_E^{(0)} \setminus U_{H_1,B_{H_1}}$ is also clopen invariant and therefore there exits a hereditary and saturated subset H_2 such that

$$G_E^{(0)} \setminus U_{H_1,B_{H_1}} = U_{H_2,B_{H_2}}$$

by Thereom 3.3.

Take $v \in E^0 \setminus (H_1 \cup H_2)$. Note that v is not a sink since all of them are in $H_1 \cup H_2$. We first show that there exists at least one path starting at v which is H_1-compatible or H_2-compatible. By way of contradiction, suppose that this is not the case. We claim that there exists $e \in E^1$ such that $s(e) = v$ and $r(e) \notin H_1 \cup H_2$. If $v \in \mathrm{Reg}(E)$ then there is an edge e, starting at v, such that $r(e) \notin H_i$ because otherwise e would be an H_i compatible path (for $i = 1, 2$). Assume v is an infinite emitter. Then $r(s^{-1}(v)) \not\subseteq H_1$ because in this case every element in $s^{-1}(v)$ is an H_1-compatible path, and we are assuming that this cannot happen. For the same reason $r(s^{-1}(v)) \not\subseteq H_2$. If there is a finite number of edges from $s^{-1}(v)$ such that their ranges are inside H_i then each of them is an H_i-compatible path, arriving at a contradiction. If $s^{-1}(v) = A \cup B$, where A and B are infinite sets and $r(f) \in H_1$ for every $f \in A$ and $r(f) \in H_2$ for every $f \in B$ then f is an H_1-compatible path (in the first case) or it is an H_2-compatible path in the second one, arriving again to a contradiction. In any case we have our claim.

Fix e_1 as before. Reasoning in the same way, for every $n \geq 2$ we can find $e_n \in E^1$ such that $s(e_n) = r(e_{n-1})$ and $r(e_n) \notin H_1 \cup H_2$. Define $x = e_1 e_2 \dots$ and apply that it is in

$U_{H_1,B_{H_1}} \sqcup U_{H_2,B_{H_2}}$. This implies that $x \in U_{H_1} \sqcup U_{H_2}$, getting a contradiction. Thus, there exists at least one path starting at v which is either H_1-compatible or H_2-compatible.

Now we show that the number of paths starting at v which are either H_1-compatible or H_2-compatible is finite. By way of contradiction, and without loss in generality we may assume that $|C_{v,H_1}| = \infty$. By Lemma 6.4 there exists $e_1 \in E^1$ such that $s(e_1) = v$, $r(e_1) \notin H$ and $r(e_1)$ satisfies Property (P). Applying the same reasoning to $r(e_1)$ we find $e_2 \in E^1$ such that $s(e_2) = r(e_1)$, $r(e_2) \notin H$ and $r(e_2)$ satisfies Property (P). Continuing in this way we find $x = e_1e_2\cdots \in E^\infty$ such that $x^0 \subseteq E^0 \setminus H$. Apply condition (a) to obtain that there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathrm{Path}(r(e_N), H) = \emptyset$, a contradiction as every vertex in x^0 connects to H.

Conversely, assume that there exist hereditary and saturated sets H_1 and H_2 satisfying the conditions in the statement. We prove that $L_K(E)$ is decomposable by showing that conditions (a) and (b) in Theorem 5.2 are satisfied for H_1.

We start by proving that condition (a) in Theorem 5.2 is satisfied. Let $x \in E^\infty$ be such that $x^0 \subseteq E^0 \setminus H_1$. By way of contradiction, assume that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $\mathrm{Path}(r(e_n), H_1) \neq \emptyset$. We claim that $|x^0| \neq \infty$. Assume that this is not the case. Since $s(x_n)$ connects to H_1, it cannot be in H_2 as $H_1 \cap H_2 = \emptyset$. Then $x^0 \subseteq E^0 \setminus (H_1 \cup H_2)$. Since for every vertex in $E^0 \setminus (H_1 \cup H_2)$ there is at least one path which is H_1-compatible or H_2-compatible, if the number of vertices in x^0 is infinite, then there are infinitely many paths starting at $s(x)$ which are either H_1-compatible or H_2-compatible, a contradiction. Since $|x^0|$ is finite, there is a cycle based at a vertex in x^0, contradicting again that for any vertex in $E^0 \setminus (H_1 \cup H_2)$ there are finitely many paths which are either H_1-compatible or H_2-compatible.

Finally we prove that condition (b) in Theorem 5.2 is satisfied. Assume that there is a vertex v such that $|\{e \in E^1 \mid s(e) = v \text{ and } \mathrm{Path}(r(e), H_1) \neq \emptyset\}| = \infty$. Denote by $C := \{e \in E^1 \mid s(e) = v \text{ and } \mathrm{Path}(r(e), H_1) \neq \emptyset\}$. We prove that $v \in H_1 \cup B_{H_1}$. By way of contradiction, assume $v \notin H_1 \cup B_{H_1}$. For every $e \in C$, let μ_e be a path starting by e such that $r(\mu_e) \in H_1$. We may assume that $\mu_e \in F_E(H_1)$. By the hypothesis there is only a finite number of them which are H_1-compatible. Therefore, there are infinitely many which are not H_1-compatible. Fix one of these, say λ. Write $\lambda = \lambda_1 \dots \lambda_{|\lambda|}$, where $\lambda_i \in E^1$. Since $\lambda \in F_E(H_1)$ we may say that $s(\lambda_{|\lambda|}) \notin H_1$, therefore $s(\lambda_{|\lambda|}) \in B_{H_1}$. Note that $s(\lambda_{|\lambda|}) \notin H_2$ because otherwise $r(\lambda) \in H_1 \cap H_2 = \emptyset$. Apply that $s(\lambda_{|\lambda|}) \notin H_1 \cup H_2$ and the hypothesis to find an H_2-compatible path ρ. Then $\lambda\rho$ is H_2-compatible. Now, the set $\{\lambda\rho\}$ is an infinite set of H_2-compatible paths starting at the vertex v, which is a contradiction to our hypothesis. □

References

[1] Gene Abrams, Pere Ara, Mercedes Siles Molina, Leavitt path algebras. A primer and handbook. *Springer*. To appear.

[2] Gene Abrams, Gonzalo Aranda Pino, The Leavitt path algebra of a graph. *J. Algebra* **293** (2005), 319–334.

[3] Pere Ara, M. Ángeles Moreno, Enrique Pardo, Nonstable K-Theory for graph algebras. *Algebra Represent. Theory* **10** (2007), 157–178.

[4] Gonzalo Aranda Pino, Alireza Nasr-Isfahani, Decomposable Leavitt path algebras for arbitrary graphs. *Forum Math.* **27** (2015), 3509–3532.

[5] Lisa Orloff Clark, Cain Edie-Michell, Astrid an Huef, Aidan Sims, Ideals of Steinberg algebras of strongly effective groupoids, with applications to Leavitt path algebras. arXiv:1601.07238v1.

[6] Lisa Orloff Clark, Aidan Sims, Equivalent groupoids have Morita equivalent Steinberg algebras. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **219** (2015), 2062–2075.

[7] Lisa Orloff Clark, Cynthia Farthing, Aidan Sims, Mark Tomforde, A groupoid generalisation of Leavitt path algebras. *Semigroup Forum*, **89** (2014), 501–517.
[8] Douglas Drinen, Mark Tomforde, The C^*-algebras of arbitrary graphs. *Rocky Mountain J. Math.* **35** (2005), 105–135.
[9] Jeong Hee Hong, Decomposability of graph C^*-algebras. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. Math. Soc. Japan* **133** (2004), 115–126.
[10] Jeong Hee Hong, Wojciech Szymańsky, The primitive ideal space of the C^*-algebras of infinite graphs. *J. Math. Soc. Japan* **56** (2004), 45–64.
[11] Nathan Jacobson, Basic algebra. I. Second edition. *W. H. Freeman and Company, New York* (1985).
[12] Alex Kumjian, David Pask, Iain Raeburn, Jean Renault, Graphs, groupoids, and Cuntz-Krieger algebras. *J. Funct. Anal.* **144** (1997), 505–541.
[13] William G. Leavitt, The module type of a ring. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **42** (1962), 113–130.
[14] Alan L.T. Paterson, Graph inverse semigroups, groupoids and their C^*-algebras. *J. Operator Theory* **48** (2002), 645–662.
[15] Iain Raeburn, Graph algebras, CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics, **103**, *Providence*, (2005).
[16] Jean Renault, A groupoid approach to C^*-algebras, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, **793** Springer, *Berlin* (1980).
[17] Benjamin Steinberg, A groupoid approach to discrete inverse semigroup algebras. *Adv. Math.* **223** (2010), 689–727.
[18] Samuel B.G. Webster, The path space of a directed graph. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **142** (2014), 213–225.

L.O. Clark: Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Otago, PO Box 56, Dunedin 9054, New Zeland
E-mail address: lclark@maths.otago.ac.nz

D. Martín Barquero: Departamento de Matemática Aplicada, Escuela Técnica Superior de Ingenieros Industriales, Universidad de Málaga. 29071 Málaga. Spain.
E-mail address: dmartin@uma.es

C. Martín González: Departamento de Álgebra Geometría y Topología, Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad de Málaga, Campus de Teatinos s/n. 29071 Málaga. Spain.
E-mail address: candido@apncs.cie.uma.es

M. Siles Molina: Departamento de Álgebra Geometría y Topología, Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad de Málaga, Campus de Teatinos s/n. 29071 Málaga. Spain.
E-mail address: msilesm@uma.es